

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

This listing of claims replaces all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

- 1 1. (Original) A method of determining whether a composite service level agreement (SLA)
2 may be met comprising:
3 calculating a baseline metric value for each of a plurality of component SLAs in a
4 computing system that operate to form a composite SLA;
5 comparing a historical metric value for each of the plurality of component SLAs to their
6 respective baseline metric value to determine if each historical metric is sufficient to ensure that
7 the composite SLA is met.

- 1 2. (Original) The method as defined in claim 1 wherein calculating the baseline metric
2 value for each of the plurality of component SLAs further comprises calculating a baseline
3 success rate for each of the plurality of component SLAs from historical data.

- 1 3. (Original) The method as defined in claim 2 wherein comparing the historical metric
2 value for each of the plurality of component SLAs further comprises comparing a historical
3 success rate for each of the plurality of component SLAs to their respective baseline success
4 rates to determine if each historical success rate is greater than or equal to each respective
5 baseline success rate.

- 1 4. (Original) The method as defined in claim 1 wherein calculating a baseline metric value
2 for each of the plurality of component SLAs further comprises calculating a baseline failure rate
3 for each of the plurality of component SLAs from historical data.

- 1 5. (Currently Amended) The method as defined in claim 4 wherein comparing a historical
2 metric [[values]] value for each of the plurality of component SLAs further comprises comparing
3 a historical failure [[rates]] rate for each of the plurality of component SLAs to their respective
4 baseline failure rates to determine if each historic failure rate is less than or equal to the
5 respective failure rate for each of the component SLAs.

1 6. – 19. (Cancelled)

1 20. (New) The method of claim 1, further comprising indicating that the composite SLA
2 cannot be met in response to determining that any of the historical metric values is insufficient
3 when compared to the respective baseline metric value.

1 21. (New) The method of claim 3, further comprising indicating that the composite SLA
2 cannot be met in response to determining that any of the historical success rates is less than the
3 respective baseline success rate.

1 22. (New) The method of claim 5, further comprising indicating that the composite SLA
2 cannot be met in response to determining that any of the historical failure rates is greater than the
3 respective baseline failure rate.

1 23. (New) The method of claim 1, wherein calculating the baseline metric value for each of
2 the plurality of component SLAs is based on a desired success rate for a composite system
3 having multiple component services associated with the corresponding component SLAs.

1 24. (New) The method of claim 23, wherein calculating the baseline metric value for each of
2 the plurality of component SLAs is further based on:
3 calculating a combined historical failure rate of the component services; and
4 determining a contribution of each component service to the combined historical failure,
5 wherein each baseline metric value is based on the respective determined contribution.

1 25. (New) The method of claim 1, further comprising:
2 calculating a combined metric value from historical data for sequential component SLAs
3 that operate sequentially to contribute to the composite SLA; and
4 comparing the combined metric value to a target combined metric value to determine if
5 the combined metric value is sufficient to meet the target combined metric value.

1 26. (New) The method of claim 25, wherein calculating the combined metric value further
2 comprises calculating a component probability distribution function (PDF) for each sequential
3 component SLA.

1 27. (New) The method of claim 26, wherein calculating the combined metric value further
2 comprises computing a composite PDF from the component PDFs.

1 28. (New) The method of claim 27, wherein computing a composite PDF from the
2 component PDFs further comprises performing a convolution of the component PDFs for each
3 component SLA.

1 29. (New) The method of claim 27, wherein calculating the combined metric value further
2 comprises:
3 calculating a cumulative distribution function (CDF) from the composite PDF;
4 determining the combined metric value by locating a value of the cumulative CDF at the
5 target combined metric value.

1 30. (New) A computer readable medium storing programs executable by a processor that,
2 when executed, perform a method comprising:
3 calculating a baseline metric value for each of a plurality of component SLAs in a
4 computing system that operate to form a composite SLA;
5 comparing a historical metric value for each of the plurality of component SLAs to their
6 respective baseline metric value to determine if each historical metric value is sufficient to
7 ensure that the composite SLA is met.

1 31. (New) The computer readable medium as defined in claim 30 wherein calculating the
2 baseline metric value for each of the plurality of component SLAs further comprises calculating
3 a baseline success rate for each of the plurality of component SLAs from historical data.

1 32. (New) The computer readable medium as defined in claim 31 wherein comparing the
2 historical metric value for each of the plurality of component SLAs further comprises comparing
3 a historical success rate for each of the plurality of component SLAs to their respective baseline
4 success rates to determine if each historical success rate is greater than or equal to each
5 respective baseline success rate.

1 33. (New) The computer readable medium as defined in claim 30 wherein calculating a
2 baseline metric value for each of the plurality of component SLAs further comprises calculating
3 a baseline failure rate for each of the plurality of component SLAs from historical data.

1 34. (New) The computer readable medium as defined in claim 33 wherein comparing a
2 historical metric value for each of the plurality of component SLAs further comprises comparing
3 a historical failure rate for each of the plurality of component SLAs to their respective baseline
4 failure rates to determine if each historic failure rate is less than or equal to the respective failure
5 rate for each of the component SLAs.